



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/084,314	02/28/2002	Stephen C. Talley	6502.0395	6854

22852 7590 05/18/2005

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER  
LLP  
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER
----------

HANNE, SARA M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2179

DATE MAILED: 05/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/084,314

Applicant(s)

TALLEY ET AL.

Examiner

Sara M Hanne

Art Unit

2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claim 23 objected to because of the following This action is responsive to the amendment received on January 21, 2005. Amended Claim 23 is noted along with originally presented claims 1-22 and 24-25 are pending in the application.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-4, 9-19, and 21-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Crovetto et al., US Patent 6570491.

As per Claims 1, 9, 14, 15, 18 and 22, Crovetto et al. teaches a method comprising using a resource string to retrieve data (directives or commands 37), the data containing a parameter associated with an element of the user interface ("a directive or command template containing the operational parameters corresponding to the selected directive 35", Column 5, lines 62-64), the parameter being integrated into a syntactical structure associated with the data ("the visual syntax builder 3 can cause the formatting of the specified directive or command and corresponding operational parameters into a command string 5", Column 4, lines 65-67), replacing the resource

string with the retrieved data (Column 5, lines 35-65), obtaining the user interface element (Column 6, lines 11-16), replacing the parameter with the element (Column 6, lines 16-23), and outputting the data (Column 6, lines 24-29).

As per Claims 2, 10, 12, 19 and 23, Crovetto et al. teaches the user interface is a graphical user interface, and the obtaining step involves obtaining a graphical user interface component ("text fields 43, drop down boxes 47 and slider controls 45", Column 6, lines 15-16).

As per Claims 3, 16 and 24, Crovetto et al. teaches the resource string to retrieve the data involves using the resource string as a key to retrieve the data from a database (resource string is a pointer to the location of the data within the database and can be thought of as a key in that respect).

As per Claims 4, 13, 21 and 25, Crovetto et al. teaches obtaining involving creating the user interface element (creates elements from the list, Column 6, lines 1-24).

As per Claim 11, Crovetto et al. teaches the data element is a textual message ("each user interface element 49 can include a label 41 identifying the operational parameter", Column 6, lines 16-17).

As per Claim 17, Crovetto et al. teaches the database remotely located from the computer system (Figure 1 and the claims).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 5-8, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crovetto et al., US Patent 6570491, and further in view of White, III et al., US Patent 6493661.

As per Claims 5 and 20, Crovetto et al. teaches a computer system having a user and a graphical user interface containing a resource string, data containing a parameter associated with a component of the user interface, the parameter being integrated into a syntactical structure associated with the data, replacing the resource string with the data; obtaining the component of the user interface, replacing the parameter with the component, and outputting the data (See rejection of Claim 1 *supra*). While Crovetto et al. teaches this said interface method, they fail to show the locale identification by the resource string as recited in the claims. In the same field of the invention, White, III et al. teaches a user interface with resource strings, and parameters similar to that of Crovetto et al. In addition, White, III et al. further teaches identifying a locale associated with the user or the computer system, using the resource string to retrieve data associated with the user's locale (Figure 1 and corresponding text). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Crovetto et al. and White, III et al. before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the user

interface taught by Crovetto et al. to include the locale association of White, III et al., in order to obtain a system for presenting text and GUI components in a language appropriate for the user according to their locale. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because a user-friendly interface would have been obtained, as taught by White, III et al.

As per Claim 6, Crovetto et al. teaches the resource string to retrieve the data involves using the resource string as a key to retrieve the data from a database (resource string is a pointer to the location of the data within the database and can be thought of as a key in that respect).

As per Claim 7, Crovetto et al. teaches creating the user interface element (creates elements from the list, Column 6, lines 1-24).

As per Claim 8, While Crovetto et al. teaches this said interface method, they fail to show the locale identification by the user query and resource string as recited in the claims. In the same field of the invention, White, III et al. teaches a user interface with resource strings, and parameters similar to that of Crovetto et al. In addition, White, III et al. further teaches allowing the user to input a query via an input device, wherein the retrieving step is performed in response to the query ("a user can specify the language in which the user would like text messages to be provided", Column 3, lines 22 et seq.). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Crovetto et al. and White, III et al. before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the user interface taught by Crovetto et al. to include the user query locale association of White, III et al., in order to obtain a user input language designated

system for presenting text and GUI components according to the user's locale. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because a user-friendly input method interface would have been obtained, as taught by White, III et al.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 1/21/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As to the argument that Crovetto fails to teach "using a resource string to retrieve data, the data containing a parameter that is associated with an element of the user interface and that is integrated into a syntactical structure associated with the data" (page 9 of the remarks submitted 1/21/05, lines 8-9) the examiner disagrees. Crovetto discloses a name of a directive or command that must be replaced by command string data at runtime, therefore a resource string to retrieve data. Furthermore Crovetto teaches this string containing a parameter ("at least one operational parameter") associated with an element of the user interface ("each user interface element 49 can include a label 41 identifying the operational parameter.", Col. 6 line 16 et seq.) within the syntax of the data ("the visual syntax builder 3 can cause the formatting of the specified directive or command and corresponding operational parameters into a command string 5", Column 4, line 65 et seq.).

As to the argument that Crovetto fails to teach "that the template includes a parameter that is associated with an element of the user interface and that is integrated

into a syntactical structure associated with the template" (page 9 of the remarks submitted 1/21/05, lines 21-22) the examiner disagrees.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, White teaches making an interface user-friendly to people speaking different languages as is suggested in the Description of Related Art, Col. 1, lines 13 et seq. and also text message strings, like the resource strings described above and a compiler to generate the displays at runtime just as in Crovetto.



***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sara M Hanne whose telephone number is (703) 305-0703. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30am-4:00pm, off on alternating Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R Herndon can be reached on (703) 308-5186. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

smh

BA HUYNH  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

5/15/05